



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,814	11/04/2003	Jeff Kline	58674 (46910)	6248
21874	7590	01/23/2006	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205			TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/700,814	Applicant(s) KLINE ET AL.	
	Examiner Nicholas R. Taylor	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-14, 16-21, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-14, 16-21, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 7-14, 16-21, 26, and 27 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/2005 with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7, 8, 10-14, 16-21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin et al. (US PGPub 2003/0115292) and Carcerano et al. (US Patent 6,308,205).

5. As per claim 7, Griffin teaches a method for administering a plurality of websites wherein at least one website is hosted at a server comprising the steps of:

administering the at least one website by accessing the website at an address corresponding to a hierarchal level by a user; (Griffin, paragraphs 0014, 0015, and 0036) and

determining the hierarchal level rights of the user; and (Griffin, paragraph 0036).

However, Griffin fails to teach providing an indicator to the user of the hierarchal level at which they have accessed the website.

Carcerano teaches a web-based management system (Carcerano, column 7, lines 29-54) with a graphical icon indicator showing the hierarchal level at which the client has accessed the website (Carcerano, column 12, lines 26-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Griffin and Carcerano to provide the management system of Carcerano in the system of Griffin, because doing so would enable networking file or device management through a familiar web browser interface, thereby simplifying management and saving time (Carcerano, column 2, lines 5-11).

6. As per claim 8, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further wherein said indicator is a graphical indicator (Carcerano, column 12, lines 26-44).

As per claim 10, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the steps of:

storing the hierarchal level of the user at the server;

allowing the user to enter said website at a different hierarchal level than that stored at the server; and

providing a second indicator corresponding to the hierarchal administrative level of the user corresponding to the level of which the user has accessed the website (Griffin, paragraph 0036, when a user chooses to access via an administrative mode rather than a regular user).

7. As per claims 11 and 26, Griffin teaches a method for administration of a plurality of websites, at least one of the plurality of websites being hosted at a remote server comprising the steps of:

administering the at least one website by accessing the at least one website at an address corresponding to a hierarchal administrative level; (Griffin, paragraphs 0014, 0015, and 0036)

obtaining login information from the user;

determining at the remote server the access rights of the user based upon access rights information stored at the remote server;

aggregating the rights of the user; (Griffin, paragraph 0036, when the authorization module 44 of figure 4 responds to a user access request).

However Griffin fails to teach:

displaying enabling icons at the website corresponding to said aggregated access rights for said user; and providing a graphical indicator of said hierarchal administrative level at which access is made to the user.

Carcerano teaches a web-based management system (Carcerano, column 7, lines 29-54) with a graphical icon indicator showing the hierarchal level at which the client has accessed the website (Carcerano, column 12, lines 26-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Griffin and Carcerano to provide the management system of Carcerano in the system of Griffin, because doing so would enable networking file or device management through a familiar web browser interface, thereby simplifying management and saving time (Carcerano, column 2, lines 5-11).

8. As per claims 12 and 27, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the step of grouping all users with common access rights into a plurality of respective groups and storing the groups at the server, determining to which group the user belongs, and enabling the access rights for the user based upon the rights granted to the group to which the user belongs (Griffin, paragraph 0036, when the authorization module 44 of figure 4 responds to a user access request).

9. As per claim 13, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the steps of determining a hierarchal level of the user (Griffin, paragraph 0036, when the authorization module 44 of figure 4 responds to a user access request).

Art Unit: 2141

10. As per claim 14, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further wherein the indicator indicates the hierarchal level corresponding to the address (Carcerano, column 12, lines 26-44).

11. As per claim 16, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the steps of determining whether a user is authorized for access at the address corresponding to the predetermined access rights utilizing the access right information stored at the remote server and, if authorized, aggregating the rights of the user (Griffin, paragraph 0036, when the authorization module 44 of figure 4 responds to a user access request).

12. As per claim 17, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the steps of:

- grouping all users with common access rights in respective groups;
- storing the respective groups at the server;
- determining to which group the user belongs; and (Griffin, tables 1-3 and figure 3)
- aggregating the rights based upon the rights associated with the specific group to which the user is a member (Griffin, paragraph 0036, when the authorization module 44 of figure 4 responds to a user access request).

Art Unit: 2141

13. As per claim 18, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the step of accessing the website at a public address, determining whether any access rights for a user accessing the website at the public address have been stored, and displaying no icons at said website for said user when no access rights have been stored at the server for said user (Carcerano, column 12, lines 26-44, when the administrator icon is not displayed).

14. As per claim 19, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further wherein said icons enable editing of material on the website (Carcerano, figure 7, item 122 and the edit buttons).

15. As per claim 20, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the steps of:

determining a hierarchal level of the user as a function of the rights of the user (Griffin, paragraphs 0018 and 0019).

16. As per claim 21, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the system further comprising the steps of:

storing the hierarchal level of the user at the server;

allowing the user to enter said website at a different hierarchal level than that stored at the server; and

providing a second indicator corresponding to the hierarchal level of the user corresponding to the level of which the user has accessed the website (Griffin, paragraph 0036, when a user chooses to access via an administrative mode rather than a regular user).

17. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin et al. (US PGPub 2003/0115292) and Carcerano et al. (US Patent 6,308,205), further in view of Swift (US Patent 6,308,274).

18. As per claim 9, Griffin-Carcerano teaches the above, including different graphical indicators to represent hierarchal levels (Carcerano, column 12, lines 26-44), yet fails to teach

wherein the graphical indicator is the color of a significant portion of the website as displayed to the user, said color corresponding to the hierarchal administrative level of the user.

Swift teaches a method of restricting access based on hierarchal levels (Swift, Summary) where color is used as a graphical indicator to display the access level to the user (Swift, column 13, lines 44-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Griffin-Carcerano and Swift to provide the color display of Swift in the system of Griffin-Carcerano, because doing so would make the current user rights obvious to help prevent accidental mistakes (Swift, column 1, lines 15-21).

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2141


RUPAL DHADIA
SUPERVISOR/ART UNIT EXAMINER